



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,524	10/10/2003	Nomo Yang	SUND 486	2933
23995 75	06/01/2005	EXAMINER		INER
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW			LETSCHER, GEORGE J	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2653	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	Office Action Summer:	10/682,524	YANG			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	71. 444.0.00.04.75	George J. Letscher	2653			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a compared for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per It is reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to receive the material state of the provisions of the material state of the provisions of the p	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (; od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10	October 2003.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with definition Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.				
	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Exami					
ا_ا(۱۰	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corresponding to th	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '			
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a life.	ents have been received. Ents have been received in Appriority documents have been releau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage			
Attachment	c(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sum				
3) 🔲 Infom	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 · No(s)/Mail Date		fail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita et al (US 5,063,548).

The aforementioned claims recite the following features, inter alia, disclosed in Yamashita et al (US 5,063,548): an isolation apparatus for a pickup head in an optically readable storage apparatus having a chassis, a spindle motor and sled motor, a pickup head (34) supported by two shafts and a motor, the isolation apparatus comprising an integrally formed insulating sheath (48) wrapping around each end of the two support shafts (38) for isolating interference between the pickup head and the motor. The size of the insulating sheath matches a size of the support shaft for tightly wrapping around the end of support shafts.

Regarding claim 1, Yamashita et al do not show its insulating sheath comprising at least four insulating sheaths. Regarding claim 5, Yamashita et al do not expressly show a grounding part of the spindle motor, sled motor and pickup head coupled to the chassis.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have furnished the isolation apparatus for a pickup head having an insulating sheath as taught by Yamashita et al with the sheath having at least four insulating sheath members. The

Application/Control Number: 10/682,524

Art Unit: 2653

rationale is as follows: one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have furnished the isolation apparatus for a pickup head having an insulating sheath as taught by Yamashita et al with the sheath having at least four insulating sheath members since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8 (7th Cir. 1977).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the isolation apparatus for a pickup head having an insulating sheath as taught by Yamashita et al with a grounding part of the spindle motor, sled motor and pickup head coupled to the chassis since one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to ground these components since without grounding, the apparatus would not have operated properly because of stray electrical signals which would have damaged the apparatus.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George J. Letscher whose telephone number is 571-272-7591.

The examiner can normally be reached on a Conventional work schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-437-3785 (toll-free).

George J. Letscher Primary Examiner Art Unit 2653

GJL 5/27/05